UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,023	07/23/2001	David B. Lection	RSW920010079US1	3490

7590   06/15/2005

Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Synnestvedt & Lechner
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER
POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/911,023	LECTION ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey D. Popham	2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *19* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,7-9 and 13-15* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4-6,10-12 and 16-18* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 March 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1.   Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by XPath (Clark et al., "XML Path Language (XPath) Version 1.0", w3c,

11/16/1999, pp. 1-37, obtained from http://www.w3.org/TR/xpath).

Regarding Claim 7,

XPath discloses a system for controlling access by a parent node to

child nodes in a DOM tree corresponding to a data file, comprising:

Means for assigning a parent-node context-value to the parent

node, the parent-node context-value being stored as character information

in the data file (Pages 5-8, Section 2);

Means for assigning a child-node context-value to each of the child

nodes, the parent-node context-value being stores as character

information in the data file (Pages 5-8, Section 2);

Means for correlating one or more of the child nodes to the parent

node (Pages 5-8, Section 2); and

Means for permitting access by the parent node only to the correlated child nodes (Pages 5-8, Section 2).

The final paragraph of page 7 illustrates a system in which an expression contains a correlation from a parent to a child to a grandchild. In this situation, the child [taken as parent node] has context value of "div" and the grandchild [taken as child node] has context value "para". The correlation exists between these nodes in the expression that allows access to only those grandchildren that have a certain context value and have a parent that has a certain context value.

Regarding Claim 1,

Claim 1 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to system claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 8,

XPath discloses that the means for correlating comprises at least means for assigning the child-node context-value of the correlated child nodes to be the same as the parent-node context value (Page 6, "descendant-or-self::para" example).

Regarding Claim 2,

Claim 2 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 8 and

is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to

system claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over XPath in view of Kloba et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0,047,394).

Regarding Claim 9,

XPath does not disclose that the means for correlating comprises at

least means for assigning the child-node context-value of the correlated

child nodes to inherit the parent-node context-value.

Kloba et al., however, disclose that the means for correlating

comprises at least means for assigning the child-node context-value of the

correlated child nodes to inherit the parent-node context-value (Page 20,

Paragraph 392). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the delegation

method of Kloba et al. into the addressing system of XPath in order to

dynamically share the behavior and properties of the objects.

Regarding Claim 3,

Claim 3 is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 9 and

is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to

system claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claims 4-6, 10-12, and 16-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 19 is allowed. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of

allowable subject matter: The closest prior art discloses assigning a parent-node

context-value to the parent node, the parent-node context-value being stored as

character information in the data file; assigning a child-node context-value to each of the

child nodes; assigning each of the parent node and the child nodes a respective name;

correlating one or more of the child nodes to the parent node by assigning the child-

node context-value of the correlated child modes to be the same as the parent-node

context-value; and permitting access by the parent node only to the correlated child

nodes. What the closest prior art fails to disclose is the encryption and decryption of node names within this system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/31/2005 have been fully considered but they are not fully persuasive.

Regarding applicants' arguments that the correlation of child nodes to the parent node is defined in the specification, the specification only states examples for what this correlation could be, never defining concretely what this correlation is.

The rest of applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of XPath and Kloba et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**